DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 348 EA 019 555

AUTHOR Adams, Charles F.; Ambrosie, Frank
TITLE Improving Educational Quality: A Role for the Regional Educational Agency.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 90p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *Education Service Centers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Low Income Counties; *Minimum Competencies; *Regional Cooperation; *Regional Programs; State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

New York State has embarked on a major effort to enhance the quality of public schooling. All schools must develop curricula ensuring that students meet minimal performance standards and provide remedial programs for those who do not. Because many school districts with low enrollments or low wealth are having difficulty complying with Board of Regents requirements, the Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) is expanding its educational delivery process to include direct academic instruction. While the number of school district requests for cooperative programs is relatively low, the new Regents requirements are only in their second year, and many academic standards provisions do not take effect until 1989. The results of a survey administered to 50 percent of the state's local superintendents show that the majority support the quality, necessity, and cost-effectiveness of BOCES services. As the compliance deadline approaches, many of the smaller and poorer districts will turn to the BOCES for assistance as they have done in the past for educational programs for handicapped students, occupational education services, and high cost instructional support services. The BOCES will undoubtedly become one important vehicle for educational improvement at the local school district level, for without them, the Regents' action plan is doomed. Two sets of data analyses are contained in the extensive appendix. The first set of analyses of BOCES survey responses is made up of cross tabulations; the second set is a frequency distribution of all responses to each item on the questionnaire. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles F. Adams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED284348

IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL QUALITY:

A ROLE FOR THE REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY

by Charles F. Adams

and

Frank Ambrosie

Wichita State University
Kansas

Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association

Washington, D.C.

April, 1987

EA 019 555

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been a myriad of studies and commission reports focusing upon the disatisfaction with the quality of public schooling (e.g. A Nation At Risk and A Study of High Schools among others).1. All propose reforms in the standards of education and have received wide-scale national attention. It was inevitable that the national notoriety generated by the various studies would also generate action at the state and local levels calling for new commitment and action from the state and local school districts. Many states have undertaken reform efforts as a result of this national attention and public and political pressure. This paper provides an analytic review of efforts of one state, New York, over the past several years to improve the quality of education. More specifically, an examination of the role of the regional service agency in the state, the Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), in this improvement effort has been undertaken for the past two years. The purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which the BOCES have been utilized by local school districts to assist them improve the quality of their educational program.

Standards setting in education is a state function and all calls to reform begin with exhortations to increase academic standards directed toward state educational agencies. This is particularly true of New York State which has a long history of strong state education department directiveness. Historically, the Board of Regents in New York State has established, maintained, revised and monitored the standards for elementary and secondary education.

REGENTS ACTION PLAN

In early 1982, the Regents and State Education Department (SED) initiated a major review of current Regents' goals for elementary and secondary education. This undertaking provided a framework for several policy reviews which were drawn together in a major plan for elementary and secondary education for the coming decades.

The Regents' goal statements have been revised to clarify intent and priority and to enable a more direct connection between the goal statements and action in the public schools of New York. Throughout the past three years the Regents have focused upon a major revision in the standards elementary and secondary educational programs are required to meet through the development, adoption and promulgation of an "Action Plan to Improve Educational Results in New York State".2. Increases in course requirements in mathemetics, science, social studies, foreign language and the arts, which are in the "Action Plan" reflect the priority for the subjects or their components (e.g. reading, writing and global studies) and also reflect increased emphisis, which additional courses in these subjects will permit, on critical thinking, reasoning and problem solving.3.

In the Regents own words, "There are five types of action that

can be taken at the state level to increase instructional requirements: course requirements, content requirements, content requirements within courses and objectives, examinations, standards for professional personnel, and procedures to be followed by local school districts or schools."4. The premise and promise of the Regents is that all recommendations included in the "Action Plan" are designed to improve the condition of teaching and learning in all schools in New York State.

The plan has been translated into a revised set of "Regulations of the Commissioner of Education" that are mandated expectations and conditions that all school districts must meet. Commissioner's Regulations in New York State are tantamount to education law. Beinging cosistant with their past actions, the Board of Regents has specified the "what" or outcomes expected of schooling in the state and has allowed, for the most part, the "how" to achieve the standards to local school districts initiative and prerogative.

The major emphasis in the new standards set forth in the "Action Plan" is on increased academic requirements for a student to qualify for high school graduation. The number of Carnegie Units required for both a high school deploma and the more prestigious Regents High School Deploma has been increased. Aditional course units in mathematics, social studies and science have been added as well as a minimal competency requirement in a second language. All students will be required to pass a state minimum competency exam in a second language by the end of the ninth grade. State syllabi are being revised to include a greater emphasis on technology at the early secondary level. Second language instruction must also be offered at the elementary level. A new minimum competency examination in science is being required at the ninth grade level. A student must pass this examination prior to taking the second unit in the new science requirement. The state syllabi provide a skeletal program description for instructional requirements. Individual school districts must develop specific curriculum including teaching objectives, activities, content materials and measures of performance.

The "Action Plan" has a careful and lengthy schedule of implementation. The schedule of new requirements for students will assure there is ample opportunity to prepare to meet the timelines. Complete implementation of the "Regents Action Plan" is to take place over a five-year period from 1985-86 to 1989-90.

Implementation of the aforementioned requirements specified in the "Action Plan" calls for a number of changes at the local school district level, many of which require additional resources. The Regents were cognizant of this dilemma and actively persued legislative changes and increased funding to aid local districts carry out these mandated reforms. Increased state aid was approved for schools by the Legislature at its last two annual sessions to meet the new Regents' requirements. Yet many of the school districts in the state find it very difficult to adopt new policies and practices due to their size, wealth, staffing and other unique

conditions. Districts in New York range in size from over 900,000 pupils to less than 100 pupils.

BOCES TRADITIONAL ROLE

The Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) were established in 1948 to provide specialized and costly services to local districts which they would have difficulty in providing for themselves. Initially the BOCES came into being as a cooperative service bureau formed by local school districts to enhance the provision of cost-effective services for rural school districts. The concept quickly grew to include other districts and culminated in the passage of the Education Law of 1950 which provided an open-ended program for the delivery of regional educational services by permitting the Commissioner of Education the latitude to include the approval of "other services" in addition to the previously narrowly defined services provided to local districts. The predominant services purchased by local school districts from the BOCES have been vocational education, services to students with handicapping conditions, student and management computer services and select specialized instructional support services such as cooperative (two or more local districts) curriculum development, staff development and audio-visual materials.

The essential BOCES instructional and instructional support elements for improving the quality of educational services for local school districts have been in place since 1950. By expanding the state approved guidelines in these areas in 1985, the BOCES were in a position to play a major role in providing the necessary assistance to local school districts for implementing quality instructional and instructional support services. Local districts have been a part of a regional governance system for over thirty years and have experienced the delivery of successful educational services from the BOCES. Part of the success of BOCES as an educational service agency can be measured by historical growth in terms of buildings, staff and budgets in responding to local district requests for specific services, which indeed they have.

Until recently, instructional services heve been limited to preclude general instructional programs. Local control over the instructional program and local district labor relations pressure have been the predominant reasons for restricting and limiting the delivery of such services. As the result of declining enrollment and the enactment of the Regents' "Action Plan", the traditional role of the BOCES in this area has been reviewed at state and regional level. The Commissioner of Education has recently stated that local school districts should seek to provide current and future instructional programming in creative and imaginative ways. The BOCES has been prominently mentioned as an alternative vehicle to be used in providing local districts with a means to meet their instructional needs. Changes were made in the state guidelines for BOCES a year ago (Exhibit I) to allow for the flexibility necessary to deliver general instructional program services which prior to that time had been prohibited. For two years now, local districts

have been permitted to contract with BOCES, on a cooperative basis, for direct instructional services in general academic areas.

To insure that all school districts regardless of size, wealth or any other measurable variable can participate in acquiring services from BOCES, a specific financial aid formula exists, on a weighted scale, which provides a reimbursement for local tax dollars spent to purchase services from the BOCES. On the average, the typical school district receives 50% of the expenditures made for BOCES' services as additional state aid (in addition to local district regular formula operating aid).

CHANGES IN BOCES ROLE

Prior to the adoption of the Regents' "Action Plan", the BOCES were restricted to providing services in the special areas described above. Following the adoption and dissemination of the Regents' blueprint for improving the quality of education in the state, the Commissioner of Education promulgated new regulations on the scope of permissable services that could be provided by BOCES. Prior to 1985, BOCES were prohibited from conducting general education programs with a few minor exceptions for itinerant teachers in special subject areas for very small schools.

From its inception, BOCES has demonstrated its effectiveness as a deliverer of occupational education and education for the handicapped. Based on many years of cooperative involvement of the local school districts through the BOCES, local school administrators had looked to this organizational arrangement as one that could assist in solving new problems with which they were confronted. In many respects, the Regents' "Action Plan" posed many new problems and challenges. The BOCES became a natural option offering a potential program solution or a service agency to meet the needs of local districts in implementing their "Action Plan". School administrators, acting on behalf of their Boards and teaching staffs, advocated the need to remove restrictions on the BOCES in order for the BOCES to prvide services that would assist school districts meet the requirements of the "Action Plan". Therefore, new Regulations of the Commissioner enabled BOCES to provide direct instruction in general academic areas previously prohibited. Specific examples of new service areas include:

Advanced English
Foreign Language
Advanced Mathematics
Advanced Science
Advanced Social Studies
Art K-12
Health Education K-12
Music K-12
General Instructional Supervision (coordinators/supervisors)

Within a BOCES region, two or more school districts can request instructional services in any of these academic areas and have the

service provided by a BOCES employee. One of the major concerns expressed by local school administrators to the new requirements specified in the "Action Plan" was how to acquire the teaching staff to offer the additional courses. Currently, New York, as well as the rest of the nation, is experiencing difficulty in recruiting and hiring teachers certified in mathematics, science and foreign languages. Smaller school districts without enough students to complete a full teaching load in any of these subject areas find it extremely difficult to find either a teacher certified in multiple subjects or part-time certified staff. These schools are the ones most anxious to obtain instructional sevices through the BOCES mechanism.

The strengthening of academic requirements for students also is requiring a re-examination of the course curricula and capabilities of teachers. In addition to the additional courses a secondary student must take, the minimal level of knowledge she/he must demonstrate on competency exams has also been increased. Again, many districts in the state must obtain the resources to evaluate and improve curricula as well as provide additional inservice for current teaching staff in new and/or modified curricular areas. The BOCES can provide the necessary sevices in these areas to assist local school districts. BOCES cooperative curriculum development and staff inservice programs, which have been operating for years, are now expanding to provide direct instructional coordination and supervision at the local level.

The "Action Plan" and its concomitant requirements for improving the quality of education have been established by the Board of Regents in New York State. The burden to meet these requirements and demonstrate improved quality has now fallen to the local school district. All school districts in the state are developing and implementing strategies to meet this challenge, albeit, not all willingly. Many have turned to the BOCES as a vehicle to assist them in at least meeting the instructional requirements and some envision that the BOCES may assist them in improving the quality of education. Finally, the Commissioner has revised regulations for
BOCES' services enabling BOCES to provide instructional and instructional support services for local school districts.

STUDY METHODOLGY AND DATA ANALYSIS

A review of the requests for BOCES services over the past three years was undertaken to ascertain the degree to which local school districts were requesting BOCES' assistance in meeting the new Regents' requirements. A comparison of the 1984-85 request for services in the instructional and instructional support areas with requests in 1985-86 and 1986-87 was made. The three years of data are summarized in Table 1. The number BOCES providing services in each category and , where the data was available, the number of students or staff served and the proposed local district expenditures for each year are listed. The source of the data was the applications for service approval filed by the BOCES with the

SED.

Over the past three years there has been growth in some BOCES instructional and instructional support services but not in others. Direct instructional programs in academic areas has increased in Art, Industrial Arts, enrichment (gifted and talented), and Summer school programs. Computer based instructional support has fluctuated; more BOCES are providing CAI and micro support serving a larger student population but the total budgeted amount for the programs has declined. Instructional coordinators serving local school districts has declined slightly. Two new programs, not previously permissable BOCES services, Specific Facilities for Academic Programs and Central Academic Programs are now provided by seven and ten BOCES respectively. Advanced placement programs conducted at BOCES sites have increased slightly while advanced placement programs conducted by itinerant teachers have declined.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

There are three basic models of service delivery that the BOCES can and does use to improve instruction at the local level. They are: 1) the scarce teacher model; 2) the expanded central campus model; and 3) the high tech model. The scarce teacher model is a response to the difficulty of obtaining competent certified teachers in certain subject areas as well as the low enrollments in small school districts. Essentially it is the hiring of an itinerant teacher by a BOCES to be shared by two or more school districts. For example, two districts may choose to meet second language competency requirements by hiring a foreign language teacher to teach an introductory course to eighth graders. They would request a foreign language teacher be provided by the BOCES which in turn would supply an itinerant teacher to serve both districts. The data on service requests for the past three years shows that this method of providing instructional services has not been growing and may in fact be declining. Although foreign language itinerant instruction has increased, mathematics, advanced science and social studies have decreased.

The expanded central campus model is designed for geographic areas with sparse population and small school districts. The BOCES would provide and operate a comprehensive high school that would offer all of the courses, including remedial, needed for a student to meet all of the minimal competency and high school graduation requirements. The student would be bussed from their local school to the central BOCES campus for either all or part of a day. A variation of this total school campus approach is the differentiation of the existing BOCES occupational education campuses to include general and advanced academic course offerings. Many of the BOCES vocational education programs are experiencing declining enrollments and thus space is becoming available at these centers. To maintain the enrollments in occupational education and to also provide the opportunity for the vocational students to meet the minimal competency requirements in math, science, writing and social studies, these courses would also be tought at the BOCES

TABLE 1

BOCES SERVICE COMPARISONS OVER THREE YEARS
1984-85 to 1986-87

	1984-85			1985-86			1986-87		
Service, Program Area	No.of BOCES	No. of Partic-ipants	Budget Amount $	No. of BOCES	No. of Partic-ipants	Budget Amount $	No. of BOCES	No. of Partic-ipants	Budget Amount
Adv. Eng.	5	371	299973	4	1801	115343	na	na	na
Mathematics	4	4868	36873	7		107844	5	131	17674
Foreign Lang	18	2483	573496	19	2465	831587	6	3198	720385
Adv. Sci.	7	34292	141171	10	17327	191563	8	11974	188888
Soc. St.	3	2315	61200	3	1828	39900	1	1270	2530
Art	14	10435	646370	17	10340	788118	31	35135	2178536
Health ScI.	8			10			8		na
Music	17	3703	585159	18	7763	795899	14	12685	647685
Ind. Arts	7	875	185142	9	1003	291375	8	2530	298578
Enrichment	23	na		18			38	113827	3591781
Summer Sch.	6	2594	456778	14	8708	1359530	13	9924	1467848
AP at Cent.	2	na		2			5	257	140453
Central Acad	0	na		0			10	4017	1179707
Coordinators	11	na		13			8		199222
Health coord	4	na		5			5		118969
C A I	24	176235	7042427	21	412008	7183350	37	231630	7035110
Micro support	34	na	1755461	31		2295769	35	430899	2015882
CIMS	17	35787	1373572	20	65524		22	94142	509342
Curr. Dev.	24	3863	1424718	21	14973	1327666	23	13541	1536007
Staff Dev	31	na	1690088	38		3213114	na	na	na
Spec Academic facilities	0	0		0		0	7	512	946925

center to those students enrolled in vocational education programs.

The Regents were equally concerned with maximizing learning opportunities for the exceptional students as well as strengthening minimums. To meet the requirements for bright students, low enrollment high school courses for gifted and advanced students could be offered at the BOCES campus. Such courses as advanced mathematics, advanced social studies and science would be offered for the excellerated and gifted high schoolers. The students would be bussed to the BOCES campus from their home school for the portion of the day needed for their special advanced courses. BOCES sites offer advantages over many high schools in that expensive science and technology labs can be established once to serve all of the students from the surronding high schools. Ten of the BOCES at the request of their comonent school districts have requested services that fit this central campus model. Currently, five BOCES are providing advanced placement courses at the BOCES campus. Also, ten of the BOCES are providing special facilities for academic programs.

The final model, high tech, would use the new and emerging telecommunications technologies for delivering instruction. Through the use of pre-packaged interactive video (computer controlled) units and courses, students would receive instruction in courses not feasible to be tought by certain schools. Many of these would be the advanced specialty courses for which there would be low enrollment or difficulty in obtaining a teacher. Many delivery modes for these courses are possible from the traditional television (tape or transmission) to interactive video disks to downloading of instructional modules from mainframe curricular data bases to the student's microcomputer. The computer-vidio disk and/or CAI approach could be combined with the itinerant teacher to offer programs to students where teacher review of student progress is essential (e.g. remedial courses in the basic competency areas or advanced English composition). From the data summarized in Table 1, it appears that a large number of BOCES are providing computer based educational services. The majority of the BOCES are provding both microcomputer support and CAI via telecommunications. However, these services are of a support nature to programs conducted by the local school district and are not instructional courses in addition to local offerings. Perhaps this proposed model of delivery of instruction will be on the near horizon for local districts and BOCES since they have a technological base from which to build new and enhanced services.

ATTITUDES OF LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS TOWARDS USING BOCES TO SUPPLEMENT LOCAL INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

To ascertain the rational underlying the decisions at the local school district level to contract with BOCES for instructional and instructional support services, a survey of school district superintendents was undertaken as a part of this year's study. A survey questionnaire was sent to a sample of chief school officiers for school districts in New York. It was a stratified random sample

of 50% of the school districts based upon school district size. Three hundred fifty (350) surveys were mailed with two hundred twenty six (226) returned. All school district size categories were represented in the resultant sample, however the smaller districts (under 500 pupils) were slightly over represented and the larger districts (over 10,000 pupils) somewhat under represented.* This can partially be explained by the fact that most small districts (91%) subscribe to a large number of BOCES services while very large districts provide most of the services themselves.

In addition to asking the superintendents which instructional and instructional support services their district subscribe to, they were asked for their reasons for subscribing and overall rating of the BOCES services. The superintendents of schools were chosen because they serve as advisors to the BOCES chief executive officer in planning programs and services and because they have the decision making authority to commit the local district to participate in the BOCES cooperative programs. They also have the responsibility to assess all instructional programs in their school district including BOCES services.

The survey responses were analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version X, using the Frequencies and Crosstabs sub-routines.5. To statistically test for significance of the contingency distributions, the Chi-square non-parametric test was employed with the probability level of .05 chosen as the error level.

Results of the survey indicated that a large percentage of the responding school districts subscribe to instructional support services, but very few to direct general academic instructional services, Tables 2 and 3. This is consistant with the data reported in Table 1, services provided by the BOCES. Cross tabular analyses were performed to analyze which categories of school districts subscribe to specific BOCES services. The pertinent resultant data tables are contained in Appendix B. The

results support the general contention of this paper that the smaller and/or poorer districts are more likely to subscribe to instructionally related BOCES services.

The reasons given by respondents for turning to BOCES for instructional and instructional support services are listed in Table 4. Efficiency or cost-effectiveness is the most frequently mentioned reason followed by lack of either enough students or adequate facilities to provide the services. Quality of staff and/or program was not frequently checked as a reason for subscribing to BOCES services. Again, the general contention is supported that the lack of resources, facilities and too few

* See Appendix A for a complete breakdown of sample and survey results.

students would seem to make the BOCES a viable program delivery option.

In order to delve more deeply into the rationale for using or not using BOCES services, opinions of the superintendents about commonly held notions concerning school district decisions to subscribe to BOCES services were solicited in the questionnaire. A summary of the responses to seven statements of rationale are displayed in Table 5. A four response Likert type scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly dissagree" was used to obtain superintendent's reactions to the seven opinion items concerning BOCES services.

Over three quarters of the superintendents responding held a positive opinion (agreed or strongly agreed) about the BOCES ability to provide expanded program offerings to their students; programs they could not provide to the students on their own. Money (i.e. additional state aid) was not seen as the primary reason school districts contract with BOCES for instructionally related programs (only 11% agreed that it was). Rather, it appears that it is ensuring that their students are not denied an opportunity for a full program of studies. Only 16% of the respondents indicated they could offer any and all instructional programs that the BOCES could. It is interesting to note that 20% of the responding districts had pupil enrollments over 3000 and that over 40% are spending over $4000.00/pupil for the 1986-87 school year. Yet, the crosstabular analyses of responses to the items did not show a disproportionate distribution of agreement with the last statement on Table 5, "BOCES really does not offer any instructional programs that we as a local school district can not offer", but it was a statement to which 84% of the respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed. (See pages 7 and 14 of Appendix A)

Table 2

Number and Percent of School Districts Subscribing To BOCES For Instructional Support Services 1986-87

Service Area	Number	Percent
Staff Development	171	76
Curriculum Development	119	53
Instructional Management Systems (computer based)	81	36
Instructional Materials Library	195	86
Others *	76	34

* Frequently mentioned were:

Computer support

Guidance

Resource persons (psychologists, speech therapists, hygenists)

Planning and evaluation

Performing Arts (Council on the Arts)

Table 3

Number and Percent of School Districts Subscribing to BOCES for General Academic Instructional Services 1986-87

Service Area	Number	Percent
Advanced Science	4	2
Advanced Mathematics	5	2
Advanced Humanities (Eng. and Soc. St.)	6	3
Advance Foreign Language	6	3
Art	13	6
Music	13	6
Computer assisted instruction	46	20
Other *	52	23

* Frequently mentioned were: Gifted / Talented
Remedial Reading and Writing
Alternative School Programs
Itinerant Teacher (unspecified)
Summer School
Drivers Education

Table 4

Reasons Cited As Most Important in the District's Decision to Contract with the BOCES for Services 1986-87

Reasons	Number	Percent
Boces more cost-effective than providing the service at the local district	140	62
Too few students to run the program at the local district level	88	39
BOCES can attract and hire more competent teachers	6	3
Local district does not have the facilities BOCES does to run the programs	59	26
BOCES can provide higher quality programs than the local district can	12	5
Other reasons	10	4

Table 5

Superintendents Opinions Concerning BOCES Services

Statements	Responses							
	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
"We could'nt have a full program for our students if it wasn't for BOCES"	56	25	102	46	45	20	18	8
"The instructional programs for students run by the BOCES are top quality"	17	8	146	70	44	21	1	1
"By sharing instructional program with other districts we have been able to enhance our educational program for students"	44	22	141	69	14	7	6	3
"Without the services of BOCES, our school district would be shortchanging our students"	38	18	125	57	41	19	13	6
"BOCES programs are a poor substitute for programs run in the local school district"	4	2	21	10	144	68	44	20
"The only reason school districts contract with BOCES is because of the state aid incentive"	5	2	19	9	151	69	43	20
"BOCES really does not offer any instructional programs that we as a local district can not offer"	4	2	31	14	131	61	50	23

SUMMARY

THE State of New York has embarked upon a major effort to enhance the quality of public schooling. All public schools are expected to have curricula and courses in place to ensure that all students meet minimal standards of performance and to provide remedial programs for those that do not. Many school districts in the state, especially those with low enrollments and low wealth, are finding it very difficult to implement all of the programs required by the Regents. Thus, the BOCES, in its role as an educational service provider for those services which schools find difficult, if not impossible to provide themselves, is experiencing the beginings of an expansion into a deliverer of direct academic instruction.

Although the number of requests from school districts for cooperative programs in the academic areas is relatively low, it must be kept in mind that this is only the second year under the Regents new requirements. Many of the provisions in terms of increased academic standards are not mandated for full implementation until 1989. The results of the survey administered to fifty percent of the local district superintendents in the state are positively revealing. It is appearent from the data analysis that the majority of the chief school administrators surveyed seem to support the quality, necessity and cost-effectiveness of the services delivered by the BOCES. As the time approaches when local districts, especially the smaller and poorer ones, must provide increased academic programming, many will turn to the BOCES for assistance as they have done in the past for educational programs for children with handicapping conditions, those pursuing occupational education and high cost instructional support services such as computer based education.

The BOCES will undoubtedly become one important vehicle for educational quality improvement for the local school district, because without them, the Regents' "Action Plan" would be just another exhortation to "do better", loudly acclaimed by all, but unlikely to be fully implemented at the local district level.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. A Nation At Risk, The Imperative for Educational Reform: An Open Letter to the American People. National Conference on Excellence in Education. April, 1983

Boyer, Ernest L. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. Carnegie Foundation, Harper and Row, New York. September, 1983.

2. New York State Board of Regents Action Plan to Improve Elementary and Secondary Education Results in New York. University of the State of New York. April, 1984.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

6. SPSS X, McGraw-Hill, New York. 1986.

ITINERANT SERVICES

Instructional Services

Program	% of Service	Grade Level
Advanced English*		
French		
Spanish		
German		
Latin		
Other Foreign Language (____)		
Advanced Mathematics*		
Advanced Science*		
Advanced Social Studies*		
Art		
Remedial Reading		
Health Education		
Business Education		
Physical Education		
Adaptive Physical Education		
Music		
Home Economics		
Driver Education		
Agriculture		
Guidance Counselor		
School Nurse Practitioner		
School Psychologist		
School Social Worker		
Occupational Therapist		
Speech Therapist		
Visually Impaired Teacher		
Hospital Based Tchr (est. cost)		
Other (_____)		

Supervisory Services

Program	% of Service	Grade Level
General Supervision/Coordination		
Elementary Supervisor		
English Supervisor		
Social Studies Supervisor		
Reading Supervisor		
Science Supervisor		
Math Supervisor		
Foreign Language Supervisor		
Secondary Ed. Supervisor		
Health & Drug Ed. Supervisor		
Pupil Personnel Svces. Supervisor		
Computer Education Supervisor		
Curriculum & Instruction Supervisor		
Career Education Supervisor		
Environmental Education Supervisor		
Alternative Education Supervisor		
General Work Experience Supervisor		
Audio-Visual Supervisor		
Vocational/Industrial Coop. Supv.		
Gifted & Talented Supervisor		
Special Education Supervisor		
Attendance Supervisor		
Other Supervisor (_____)		
Business Official		
Vocational Evaluator (est. # of evaluations)		

Exhibit I

* Advanced academic subjects are defined as:

1) 11th or 12th grade level academic subjects which exceed minimum requirements for a Regents diploma, or
2) Academic subjects requiring advanced ability, or
3) Academic subjects which are the advanced level of standard Regents-level courses, e.g.: Biology: Advanced Biology, or
4) Advanced placement courses

APPENDIX A

Data Analyses of BOCES Survey Responses 1986-87

Two sets of data analyses are contained in this appendix. The first set of analyses are crosstabulations. These are matches of responses to two different items. For example, the responses of "District Size" are cross tabulated with the responses to question 16. "BOCES does not really offer any instructional programs that we as a local school district can not offer". The crosstabs are presented in table form for easy interpretation. The upper left corner of each table indicates what each value in each cell of the table represents. The Chi-square values and probability levels are printed below the tables.

The second set is a frequency distribution of all responses to each item on the questionnaire. If a respondent did not respond to a particular item, left it blank, it will be reported as "missing values" on the reports. Each page represents the analysis to one item. The frequency analyses are in the same order as the questions and responses on the questionnaire.

CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE DIST SIZE BY Q10 NO PROG

SIZE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q10 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 LESS THAN 500		10	14	7	2	33
		30.3	42.4	21.2	6.1	14.9
		17.9	13.7	15.6	11.1	
		4.5	6.3	3.2	.9	
2 501 - 1000		10	19	10	2	41
		24.4	46.3	24.4	4.9	18.6
		17.9	18.6	22.2	11.1	
		4.5	8.6	4.5	.9	
3 1001 - 2000		21	33	14	5	73
		28.8	45.2	19.2	6.8	33.0
		37.5	32.4	31.1	27.8	
		9.5	14.9	6.3	2.3	
4 2001 - 3000		9	14	6	2	30
		26.7	46.7	20.0	6.7	13.6
		14.3	13.7	13.3	11.1	
		3.6	6.3	2.7	.9	
5 3001 - 6000		5	16	6	2	29
		17.2	55.2	20.7	6.9	13.1
		8.9	15.7	13.3	11.1	
		2.3	7.2	2.7	.9	
6 6001 - 10000		2	5	2	4	13
		15.4	38.5	15.4	30.8	5.9
		3.6	4.9	4.4	22.2	
		.9	2.3	.9	1.8	
7 OVER 10000			1		1	2
			50.0		50.0	.9
			1.0		5.6	
			.5		.5	
COLUMN TOTAL		56	102	45	18	221
		25.3	46.2	20.4	8.1	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
17.68919	18	0.4763	0.163	11 OF 28 (39.3%)

SIZE DIST SIZE — CROSSTABULATION OF — BY Q11 — TOP QUAL

Q11

SIZE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
LESS THAN 500	1	4	22	3		29
		13.8	75.9	10.3		13.9
		23.5	15.1	6.8		
		1.9	10.6	1.4		
501 - 1000	2	1	30	9		40
		2.5	75.0	22.5		19.2
		5.9	20.5	20.5		
		.5	14.4	4.3		
1001 - 2000	3	8	44	15	1	68
		11.8	64.7	22.1	1.5	32.7
		47.1	30.1	34.1	100.0	
		3.8	21.2	7.2	.5	
2001 - 3000	4	2	20	8		30
		6.7	66.7	26.7		14.4
		11.8	13.7	18.2		
		1.0	9.6	3.8		
3001 - 6000	5	1	19	7		27
		3.7	70.4	25.9		13.0
		5.9	13.0	15.9		
		.5	9.1	3.4		
6001 - 10000	6	1	10	1		12
		8.3	83.3	8.3		5.8
		5.9	6.8	2.3		
		.5	4.8	.5		
OVER 10000	7		1	1		2
			50.0	50.0		1.0
			.7	2.3		
			.5	.5		
	COLUMN TOTAL	17	146	44	1	208
		8.2	70.2	21.2	.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
11.85877	18	0.8544	0.010	16 OF 28 (57.1%)

CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE DIST SIZE BY Q12 ENHANC. PROG

SIZE	Q12 STRONG AGREE (1)	AGREE (2)	DISAGREE (3)	STRONG DISAGREE (4)	ROW TOTAL
1 LESS THAN 500	7	22	2		31
	22.6	71.0	6.5		15.1
	15.9	15.6	14.3		
	3.4	10.7	1.0		
2 501 - 1000	8	24	2	1	35
	22.9	68.6	5.7	2.9	17.1
	18.2	17.0	14.3	16.7	
	3.9	11.7	1.0	.5	
3 1001 - 2000	15	49	4	2	70
	21.4	70.0	5.7	2.9	34.1
	34.1	34.8	28.6	33.3	
	7.3	23.9	2.0	1.0	
4 2001 - 3000	4	21	3		28
	14.3	75.0	10.7		13.7
	9.1	14.9	21.4		
	2.0	10.2	1.5		
5 3001 - 6000	6	16	3	1	26
	23.1	61.5	11.5	3.8	12.7
	13.6	11.3	21.4	16.7	
	2.9	7.8	1.5	.5	
6 6001 - 10000	4	8		1	13
	30.8	61.5		7.7	6.3
	9.1	5.7		16.7	
	2.0	3.9		.5	
7 OVER 1000		1		1	2
		50.0		50.0	1.0
		.7		16.7	
		.5		.5	
COLUMN TOTAL	44	141	14	6	205
	21.5	68.8	6.8	2.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
22.94083	18	0.1929	0.054	27 OF 28 (60.7%)

CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE BY DIST SIZE BY Q13 CHECKLANDS

Q13

SIZE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
LESS THAN 500	1	5	20	7		32
		15.6	62.5	21.9		14.7
		12.2	16.0	17.1		
		2.3	9.2	3.2		
501 - 1000	2	7	26	6	1	40
		17.5	65.0	15.0	2.5	18.4
		18.4	20.8	14.6	7.7	
		3.2	12.0	2.8	.5	
1001 - 2000	3	16	36	18	2	72
		22.2	50.0	25.0	2.8	33.2
		42.1	28.8	43.9	15.4	
		7.4	16.6	8.3	.9	
2001 - 3000	4	4	18	4	4	30
		13.3	60.0	13.3	13.3	13.8
		10.5	14.4	9.8	30.8	
		1.8	8.3	1.8	1.8	
3001 - 6000	5	3	18	5	2	28
		10.7	64.3	17.9	7.1	12.9
		7.9	14.4	12.2	15.4	
		1.4	8.3	2.3	.9	
6001 - 10000	6	3	6	1	3	13
		23.1	46.2	7.7	23.1	6.0
		7.9	4.8	2.4	23.1	
		1.4	2.8	.5	1.4	
OVER 10000	7		1		1	2
			50.0		50.0	.9
			.8		7.7	
			.5		.5	
COLUMN TOTAL		38	125	41	13	217
		17.5	57.6	18.9	6.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
27.56862	18	0.0689	0.120	13 OF 28 (46.4%)

CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE DIST SIZE BY Q14 PAGE 30

SIZE	Q14	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	5	ROW TOTAL
LESS THAN 500	1	1 2.9 25.0 .5	3 8.6 14.3 1.4	23 65.7 16.0 10.8	8 22.9 18.6 3.8		35 16.4
501 - 1000	2		6 15.8 28.6 2.8	25 65.8 17.4 11.7	7 18.4 16.3 3.3		38 17.8
1001 - 2000	3	2 2.9 50.0 .9	8 11.6 38.1 3.8	43 62.3 29.9 20.2	16 23.2 37.2 7.5		69 32.4
2001 - 3000	4		2 10.5 14.3 1.4	21 72.4 14.6 9.9	5 17.2 11.6 2.3		29 13.6
3001 - 6000	5	1 1.4 25.0 .5	1 3.4 4.8 .5	21 72.4 14.6 9.9	5 17.2 11.6 2.3	1 3.4 100.0 .5	29 13.6
6001 - 10000	6		1 7.7 4.8 .5	10 76.9 6.9 4.7	2 15.4 4.7 .9		13 6.1
OVER 10000	7		1 50.0 4.8 .5	1 50.0 .7 .5			2 .9
	COLUMN TOTAL	4 1.9	21 9.9	144 67.6	43 20.2	1 .5	213 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
18.77416	24	0.7639	0.009	23 OF 35 (65.7%)

CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE BY DIST SIZE BY Q15 STATE AT

SIZE	Q15	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
LESS THAN 500	1	1 3.0 5.3 .5	18 54.5 11.9 8.3	14 42.4 22.4 6.4		33 15.1
501 - 1000	2	6 15.0 31.6 2.8	26 65.0 17.2 11.9	8 20.0 12.9 3.7		40 18.3
1001 - 2000	3	2 2.8 40.0 .9	5 6.9 26.3 2.3	52 72.2 34.4 23.9	13 18.1 20.9 6.0	72 33.0
2001 - 3000	4	2 6.9 40.0 .9	4 13.8 21.1 1.8	20 69.0 13.2 9.2	3 10.3 4.8 1.4	29 13.3
3001 - 6000	5	3 10.3 15.8 1.4	25 86.2 16.6 11.5	1 3.4 1.6 .5		29 13.3
6001 - 10000	6	1 7.7 20.0 .5	9 69.2 6.0 4.1	3 23.1 4.8 1.4		13 6.0
OVER 10000	7		1 50.0 .7 .5	1 50.0 1.6 .5		2 .9
COLUMN TOTAL		5 2.3	19 8.7	151 69.3	42 19.3	218 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
29.79210	18	0.0395	0.046	16 OF 28 (57.1%)

CROSS TABULATION OF SIZE DIST SIZE BY Q15 DIST CAN

SIZE		Q15 1 STRONG AGREE	1I AGREE	2I	3I DISAGREE	4I STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
LESS THAN 500	1	1 1.1 25.0 .5	5 15.6 16.1 2.3	15 46.9 11.5 6.9	11 34.4 22.0 5.1		32 14.8
501 - 1000	2		6 15.4 19.4 2.8	24 61.5 18.3 11.1	9 23.1 18.0 4.2		39 18.1
1001 - 2000	3	2 2.8 50.0 .9	6 8.3 19.4 2.8	47 65.3 35.9 21.8	17 23.6 34.0 7.9		72 33.3
2001 - 3000	4		8 27.6 25.8 3.7	16 55.2 12.2 7.4	5 17.2 10.0 2.3		29 13.4
3001 - 6000	5		4 13.8 12.9 1.9	20 69.0 15.3 9.3	5 17.2 10.0 2.3		29 13.4
6001 - 10000	6	1 7.7 25.0 .5	1 7.7 3.2 .5	8 61.5 6.1 3.7	3 23.1 6.0 1.4		13 6.0
OVER 1000	7		1 50.0 3.2 .5	1 50.0 .8 .5			2 .9
COLUMN TOTAL		4 1.9	31 14.4	131 60.6	50 23.1		216 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
17.30180	18	0.5025	0.037	15 OF 28 (53.6%)

CROSSTABULATION OF
EXP EXPEND PER PUPIL BY Q10 NO PRINT

EXP	Q10	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
LESS THAN $2500	1	7	3	2	1	13
		53.9	23.1	15.4	7.7	4.8
		24.0	3.2	4.8	5.6	
		2.6	1.5	1.0	.5	
$2501 TO 3000	2	9	21	9	1	40
		22.5	52.5	22.5	2.5	14.8
		18.0	22.1	21.4	5.6	
		4.4	10.2	4.4	.5	
$3001 TO 4000	3	15	29	15	4	63
		23.8	46.0	23.8	6.3	23.7
		30.0	30.5	35.7	22.2	
		7.3	14.1	7.3	2.0	
OVER $4000	4	19	41	16	11	86
		20.9	47.7	18.6	12.8	42.0
		38.0	43.2	38.1	61.1	
		8.8	20.0	7.8	5.4	
	5	1	1		1	3
		33.3	33.3		33.3	1.5
		2.0	1.1		5.6	
		.5	.5		.5	
COLUMN TOTAL		50	95	42	18	205
		24.4	46.3	20.5	8.8	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
14.42237	12	0.2746	0.263	8 OF 20 (40.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.12981	0.0319

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 21

CROSSTABULATION OF EXP EXPEND PER PUPIL BY Q11 TOP 4

EXP	Q11 STRONG A AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONG D DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 LESS THAN 2500	1 9.1 6.3 .5	7 63.6 5.3 3.6	3 27.3 7.0 1.6		11 5.7
2 2501 TO 3000	3 7.9 18.8 1.6	24 63.2 18.2 12.5	11 28.9 25.6 5.7		38 19.8
3 3001 TO 4000	3 5.0 18.8 1.6	42 70.0 31.8 21.9	14 23.3 32.6 7.3	1 1.7 100.0 .5	60 31.3
4 OVER 4000	9 21.1 56.3 4.7	57 70.4 43.2 29.7	15 18.5 34.9 7.8		81 42.2
5		2 100.0 1.5 1.0			2 1.0
COLUMN TOTAL	16 8.3	132 68.8	43 22.4	1 .5	192 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
6.33666	12	0.8992	0.010	11 OF 20 (55.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	-0.09859	0.0869

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 34

CROSSTABULATION OF EXP EXPEND PER PUPIL BY Q12 ENHANCE PROG

EXP	Q12	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 LESS THAN 2500	COUNT	1	10	1		12
	ROW PCT	8.3	83.3	8.3		6.3
	COL PCT	2.5	7.6	7.7		
	TOT PCT	.5	5.3	.5		
2 $ 2501 TO 3000	COUNT	8	27	1	1	37
	ROW PCT	21.6	73.0	2.7	2.7	19.5
	COL PCT	20.0	20.6	7.7	16.7	
	TOT PCT	4.2	14.2	.5	.5	
3 $3001 TO 4000	COUNT	14	41	5	1	61
	ROW PCT	23.0	67.2	8.2	1.6	32.1
	COL PCT	35.0	31.3	38.5	16.7	
	TOT PCT	7.4	21.6	2.6	.5	
4 OVER $4000	COUNT	17	50	6	4	77
	ROW PCT	22.1	64.9	7.8	5.2	40.5
	COL PCT	42.5	38.2	46.2	66.7	
	TOT PCT	8.9	26.3	3.2	2.1	
5	COUNT	3				3
	ROW PCT	100.0				1.6
	COL PCT	2.3				
	TOT PCT	1.6				
COLUMN TOTAL		40	131	13	6	190
		21.1	68.9	6.8	3.2	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
6.16650	12	0.9075	0.095	12 OF 20 (60.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.03278	0.3267

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 36

29 JAN 82 PUBLIC SERVICES SURVEY
09:11:30 THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY IBM 4341 VM/SP CMS

CROSSTABULATION OF EXP BY Q17 CONTROLLED

EXPEND PER PUPIL

EXP	Q17 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 LESS THAN 2500		1	9	2	1	13
		7.7	69.2	15.4	7.7	4.5
		3.2	7.6	5.0	9.1	
		.3	4.5	1.0	.5	
2 $2501 TO 3000		5	25	7	1	38
		13.2	65.8	18.4	2.6	19.9
		16.1	21.2	17.5	9.1	
		2.5	12.4	3.5	.5	
3 $3001 TO 4000		11	35	16		62
		17.7	56.5	25.8		30.8
		35.5	29.7	40.0		
		5.5	17.4	8.0		
4 OVER $4000		14	47	15	9	85
		16.5	55.3	17.6	10.6	42.3
		45.2	39.8	37.5	75.0	
		7.0	23.4	7.5	4.5	
5			2		1	3
			66.7		33.3	1.5
			1.7		8.3	
			1.0		.5	
COLUMN TOTAL		31	118	40	12	201
		15.4	58.7	19.9	6.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
15.54415	12	0.2130	0.179	9 OF 20 (45.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.05936	0.2013

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 25

CROSSTABULATION OF EXP EXPEND PER PUPIL BY Q14 PAGE 38

EXP	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q14 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	5	ROW TOTAL
1 LESS THAN 2500			1	9	3		13
			7.7	69.2	23.1		6.6
			4.8	6.8	7.9		
			.5	4.6	1.5		
2 $ 2501 TO 3000			6	26	7		39
			15.4	66.7	17.9		19.8
			28.6	19.5	18.4		
			3.0	13.2	3.6		
3 $3001 TO 4000		2	7	36	12		57
		3.5	12.3	63.2	21.1		28.9
		50.0	33.3	27.1	31.6		
		1.0	3.6	18.3	6.1		
4 OVER $4000		2	7	59	16	1	85
		2.4	8.2	69.4	18.8	1.2	43.1
		50.0	33.3	44.4	42.1	100.0	
		1.0	3.6	29.9	8.1	.5	
5				3			3
				100.0			1.5
				2.3			
				1.5			
COLUMN TOTAL		4	21	133	38	1	197
		2.0	10.7	67.5	19.3	.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
6.44202	16	0.9826	0.015	16 OF 25 (64.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.00456	0.4747

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 29

CROSSTABULATION OF EXP EXPEND PER PUPIL BY Q15 STAFF M

EXP	Q15	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
LESS THAN 2500	1	1	2	9	1	13
		7.7	15.4	69.2	7.7	6.4
		20.0	10.5	6.3	3.8	
		.5	1.0	4.5	.5	
$ 2501 TO 3000	2	1	5	29	4	39
		2.6	12.8	74.4	10.3	19.3
		20.0	26.3	20.4	15.4	
		.5	2.5	14.4	2.0	
$3001 TO 4000	3	1	10	41	10	62
		1.6	16.1	66.1	16.1	30.7
		20.0	52.6	28.9	37.0	
		.5	5.0	20.3	5.0	
OVER $4000	4	2	5	60	19	86
		2.4	5.8	70.6	22.1	42.1
		40.0	26.3	42.3	70.4	
		1.0	2.5	29.7	9.4	
	5			3		3
				100.0		1.5
				2.1		
				1.5		
COLUMN TOTAL		5	19	142	36	202
		2.5	9.4	70.3	17.8	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
9.87699	12	0.6268	0.074	11 OF 20 (55.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.03447	0.0906

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 24

CROSSTABULATION OF EXP EXPEND PER PUPIL BY Q16 DIST CAR

EXP	Q16	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 LESS THAN 2500	COUNT		1	9	2	12
	ROW PCT		8.3	75.0	16.7	6.0
	COL PCT		3.3	7.3	4.8	
	TOT PCT		.5	4.5	1.0	
2 $ 2501 TO 3000	COUNT		5	22	11	38
	ROW PCT		13.2	57.9	28.9	19.0
	COL PCT		16.7	17.7	26.2	
	TOT PCT		2.5	11.0	5.5	
3 $3001 TO 4000	COUNT	1	10	40	11	62
	ROW PCT	1.6	16.1	64.5	17.7	31.0
	COL PCT	25.0	33.3	32.3	26.2	
	TOT PCT	.5	5.0	20.0	5.5	
4 OVER $4000	COUNT	2	14	51	18	85
	ROW PCT	2.4	16.5	60.0	21.2	42.5
	COL PCT	50.0	46.7	41.1	42.9	
	TOT PCT	1.0	7.0	25.5	9.0	
5	COUNT	1		2		3
	ROW PCT	33.3		66.7		1.5
	COL PCT	25.0		1.6		
	TOT PCT	.5		1.0		
COLUMN TOTAL		4	30	124	42	200
		2.0	15.0	62.0	21.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
19.64676	12	0.0741	0.060	10 OF 20 (50.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	-0.10034	0.0787

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 26

CROSSTABULATION OF TAXR TRUE TAX RATE BY Q10 NO PROC

TAXR	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q10 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 UNDER $15.00		13 / 31.0 / 23.6 / 6.2	17 / 40.5 / 17.7 / 8.1	9 / 21.4 / 22.5 / 4.3	3 / 7.1 / 16.7 / 1.4	42 / 20.1
2 $15.01 TO 19.99		27 / 28.7 / 49.1 / 12.9	43 / 45.7 / 44.8 / 20.6	18 / 19.1 / 45.0 / 8.6	6 / 6.4 / 33.3 / 2.9	94 / 45.0
3 $20.00 TO 25.00		9 / 23.7 / 16.4 / 4.3	13 / 34.2 / 13.5 / 6.2	11 / 28.9 / 27.5 / 5.3	5 / 13.2 / 27.8 / 2.4	38 / 18.2
4 $25.01 TO 30.00			9 / 81.8 / 9.4 / 4.3	1 / 9.1 / 2.5 / .5	1 / 9.1 / 5.6 / .5	11 / 5.3
5 OVER 30.00		5 / 21.7 / 9.1 / 2.4	14 / 60.9 / 14.6 / 6.7	1 / 4.3 / 2.5 / .5	3 / 13.0 / 16.7 / 1.4	23 / 11.0
6 SPEC DIST		1 / 100.0 / 1.8 / .5				1 / .5
COLUMN TOTAL		55 / 26.3	96 / 45.9	40 / 19.1	18 / 8.6	209 / 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
19.46016	15	0.1936	0.086	11 OF 24 (45.8%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.03934	0.2859

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 17

CROSSTABULATION OF TAXR TRUE TAX RATE BY Q11 TCP QUAL

TAXR	Q11	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 UNDER $15.00	COUNT	1	26	12		39
	ROW PCT	2.6	66.7	30.8		19.9
	COL PCT	6.3	19.0	28.6		
	TOT PCT	.5	13.3	6.1		
2 $15.01 TO 19.99	COUNT	7	64	18		89
	ROW PCT	7.9	71.9	20.2		45.4
	COL PCT	43.8	46.7	42.9		
	TOT PCT	3.6	32.7	9.2		
3 $20.00 TO 25.00	COUNT	6	22	7	1	36
	ROW PCT	16.7	61.1	19.4	2.8	18.4
	COL PCT	37.5	16.1	16.7	100.0	
	TOT PCT	3.1	11.2	3.6	.5	
4 $25.01 TO 30.00	COUNT		7	3		10
	ROW PCT		70.0	30.0		5.1
	COL PCT		5.1	7.1		
	TOT PCT		3.6	1.5		
5 OVER 30.00	COUNT	2	17	2		21
	ROW PCT	9.5	81.0	9.5		10.7
	COL PCT	12.5	12.4	4.8		
	TOT PCT	1.0	8.7	1.0		
6 SPEC DIST	COUNT		1			1
	ROW PCT		100.0			.5
	COL PCT		.7			
	TOT PCT		.5			
COLUMN TOTAL		16	137	42	1	196
		8.2	69.9	21.4	.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
14.75078	15	0.4695	0.005	15 OF 24 (62.5%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	-0.10908	0.0640

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 30

CROSSTABULATION OF TAXR TRUE TAX RATE BY Q12 ENHANCE PROG

TAXR	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q12 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 UNDER $15.00		9 / 23.7 / 22.0 / 4.7	26 / 68.4 / 19.4 / 13.5	1 / 2.6 / 8.3 / .5	2 / 5.3 / 33.3 / 1.0	38 / 19.7
2 $15.01 TO 19.99		20 / 22.7 / 48.8 / 10.4	59 / 67.0 / 44.0 / 30.6	7 / 8.0 / 58.3 / 3.6	2 / 2.3 / 33.3 / 1.0	88 / 45.6
3 $20.00 TO 25.00		6 / 17.6 / 14.6 / 3.1	25 / 73.5 / 18.7 / 13.0	2 / 5.9 / 16.7 / 1.0	1 / 2.9 / 16.7 / .5	34 / 17.6
4 $25.01 TO 30.00			8 / 80.0 / 6.0 / 4.1	2 / 20.0 / 16.7 / 1.0		10 / 5.2
5 OVER 30.00		6 / 27.3 / 14.6 / 3.1	15 / 68.2 / 11.2 / 7.8		1 / 4.5 / 16.7 / .5	22 / 11.4
6 SPEC DIST			1 / 100.0 / .7 / .5			1 / .5
COLUMN TOTAL		41 / 21.2	134 / 69.4	12 / 6.2	6 / 3.1	193 / 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
10.53891	15	0.7845	0.031	1 OF 24 (62.5%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.01069	0.4414

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 33

CROSSTABULATION OF TAXR TRUE TAX RATE BY Q13 SHORTCHANGE

TAXR	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q13 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 UNDER $15.00		5	28	8	1	42
		11.9	66.7	19.0	2.4	20.5
		13.9	23.7	20.5	8.3	
		2.4	13.7	3.9	.5	
2 $15.01 TO 19.99		19	53	16	4	92
		20.7	57.6	17.4	4.3	44.9
		52.8	44.9	41.0	33.3	
		9.3	25.9	7.8	2.0	
3 $20.00 TO 25.00		7	15	11	3	36
		19.4	41.7	30.6	8.3	17.6
		19.4	12.7	28.2	25.0	
		3.4	7.3	5.4	1.5	
4 $25.01 TO 30.00			8	2	1	11
			72.7	18.2	9.1	5.4
			6.8	5.1	8.3	
			3.9	1.0	.5	
5 OVER 30.00		5	13	2	3	23
		21.7	56.5	8.7	13.0	11.2
		13.9	11.0	5.1	25.0	
		2.4	6.3	1.0	1.5	
6 SPEC DIST			1			1
			100.0			.5
			.8			
			.5			
COLUMN TOTAL		36	118	39	12	205
		17.6	57.6	19.0	5.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
14.63190	15	0.4782	0.059	12 OF 24 (50.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.05373	0.2221

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 21

18.

CROSSTABULATION OF TAXR TRUE TAX RATE BY Q14 . POOR SUB

TAXR	Q14 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	5	ROW TOTAL
1 UNDER $15.00		8 19.5 38.1 4.0	28 68.3 20.9 13.9	5 12.2 12.2 2.5		41 20.4
2 $15.01 TO 19.99	2 2.3 50.0 1.0	8 9.1 38.1 4.0	59 67.0 44.0 29.4	19 21.6 46.3 9.5		88 43.8
3 $20.00 TO 25.00	1 2.7 25.0 .5	4 10.8 19.0 2.0	23 62.2 17.2 11.4	8 21.6 19.5 4.0	1 2.7 100.0 .5	37 18.4
4 $25.01 TO 30.00	1 9.1 25.0 .5		10 90.9 7.5 5.0			11 5.5
5 OVER 30.00		1 4.3 4.8 .5	13 56.5 9.7 6.5	9 39.1 22.0 4.5		23 11.4
6 SPEC DIST			1 100.0 .7 .5			1 .5
COLUMN TOTAL	4 2.0	21 10.4	134 66.7	41 20.4	1 .5	201 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
23.56740	20	0.2618	0.005	21 OF 30 (70.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.13169	0.0312

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 25

19 JAN 87 BOCES SERVICES SURVEY
09:31:07 THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY IBM 3081D VM/SP CMS

CROSSTABULATION OF TAXR TRUE TAX RATE BY Q15 STATE AID

TAXR	Q15 STRONG AGREE (1)	AGREE (2)	DISAGREE (3)	STRONG DISAGREE (4)	ROW TOTAL
1 UNDER $15.00	1	7	30	4	42
	2.4	16.7	71.4	9.5	20.4
	20.0	36.8	21.0	10.3	
	.5	3.4	14.6	1.9	
2 $15.01 TO 19.99	3	5	62	22	92
	3.3	5.4	67.4	23.9	44.7
	60.0	26.3	43.4	56.4	
	1.5	2.4	30.1	10.7	
3 $20.00 TO 25.00		7	24	6	37
		18.9	64.9	16.2	18.0
		36.8	16.8	15.4	
		3.4	11.7	2.9	
4 $25.01 TO 30.00	1		10		11
	9.1		90.9		5.3
	20.0		7.0		
	.5		4.9		
5 OVER 30.00			17	6	23
			73.9	26.1	11.2
			11.9	15.4	
			8.3	2.9	
6 SPEC DIST				1	1
				100.0	.5
				2.6	
				.5	
COLUMN TOTAL	5	19	143	39	206
	2.4	9.2	69.4	18.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
25.88236	15	0.0393	0.024	15 OF 24 (62.5%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.11435	0.0509

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 20

CROSSTABULATION OF TAXR TRUE TAX RATE BY Q16 DIST CAN

TAXR	Q16 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 UNDER $15.00		6 14.6 20.0 2.9	27 65.9 22.0 13.2	8 19.5 17.0 3.9	41 20.1
2 $15.01 TO 19.99	1 1.1 25.0 .5	14 15.4 46.7 6.9	53 58.2 43.1 26.0	23 25.3 48.9 11.3	91 44.6
3 $20.00 TO 25.00	1 2.7 25.0 .5	7 18.9 23.3 3.4	20 54.1 16.3 9.8	9 24.3 19.1 4.4	37 18.1
4 $25.01 TO 30.00		2 18.2 6.7 1.0	9 81.8 7.3 4.4		11 5.4
5 OVER 30.00	2 8.7 50.0 1.0	1 4.3 3.3 .5	14 60.9 11.4 6.9	6 26.1 12.8 2.9	23 11.3
6 SPEC DIST				1 100.0 2.1 .5	1 .5
COLUMN TOTAL	4 2.0	30 14.7	123 60.3	47 23.0	204 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
16.80431	15	0.3307	0.020	12 OF 24 (50.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	-0.01796	0.3994

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

CROSSTABULATION OF LSER LENGTH SUPT SERVICE BY Q10 NO PROG

LSER		Q10 STRONG AGREE (1)	AGREE (2)	DISAGREE (3)	STRONG DISAGREE (4)	ROW TOTAL
LESS THAN 1 YR	1	10	14	4	3	31
		32.3	45.2	12.9	9.7	14.0
		17.9	13.7	8.9	16.7	
		4.5	6.3	1.8	1.4	
1 TO 3 YRS	2	11	22	12	1	46
		23.9	47.8	26.1	2.2	20.8
		19.6	21.6	26.7	5.6	
		5.0	10.0	5.4	.5	
4 TO 6 YRS	3	11	33	12	7	63
		17.5	52.4	19.0	11.1	28.5
		19.6	32.4	26.7	38.9	
		5.0	14.9	5.4	3.2	
7 TO 10 YRS	4	9	14	9	3	35
		25.7	40.0	25.7	8.6	15.8
		16.1	13.7	20.0	16.7	
		4.1	6.3	4.1	1.4	
OVER 10 YRS	5	15	19	8	4	46
		32.6	41.3	17.4	8.7	20.8
		26.8	18.6	17.8	22.2	
		6.8	8.6	3.6	1.8	
COLUMN TOTAL		56	102	45	18	221
		25.3	46.2	20.4	8.1	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
9.35372	12	0.6725	2.525	4 OF 20 (20.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.01110	0.4348

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

CROSSTABULATION OF LSER LENGTH SERVICE BY Q11 TOP QUAL

LSER	Q11 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 LESS THAN 1 YR	5	23	5		28
	17.9	82.1	17.9		13.5
	11.4	15.8	11.4		
	2.4	11.1	2.4		
2 1 TO 3 YRS	5	30	8		43
	11.6	69.8	18.6		20.7
	29.4	20.5	18.2		
	2.4	14.4	3.8		
3 4 TO 6 YRS	4	45	9	1	59
	6.8	76.3	15.3	1.7	28.4
	23.5	30.8	20.5	100.0	
	1.9	21.6	4.3	.5	
4 7 TO 10 YRS	2	23	9		34
	5.9	67.6	26.5		16.3
	11.8	15.8	20.5		
	1.0	11.1	4.3		
5 OVER 10 YRS	6	25	13		44
	13.6	56.8	29.5		21.2
	35.3	17.1	29.5		
	2.9	12.0	6.3		
COLUMN TOTAL	17	146	44	1	208
	8.2	70.2	21.2	.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
12.60693	12	0.3982	0.135	10 OF 20 (50.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.03225	0.3219

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 18

CROSSTABULATION OF LSER LENGTH SERVICE BY Q12 ENHANCE PROG

LSER		Q12 1 STRONG AGREE	Q12 2 AGREE	Q12 3 DISAGREE	Q12 4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
LESS THAN 1 YR	1	4	24			28
		14.3	85.7			13.7
		9.1	17.0			
		2.0	11.7			
1 TO 3 YRS	2	11	31	2		44
		25.0	70.5	4.5		21.5
		25.0	22.0	14.3		
		5.4	15.1	1.0		
4 TO 6 YRS	3	12	39	7	1	59
		20.3	66.1	11.9	1.7	28.8
		27.3	27.7	50.0	16.7	
		5.9	19.0	3.4	.5	
7 TO 10 YRS	4	8	19	2	3	32
		25.0	59.4	6.3	9.4	15.6
		18.2	13.5	14.3	50.0	
		3.9	9.3	1.0	1.5	
OVER 10 YRS	5	9	28	3	2	42
		21.4	66.7	7.1	4.8	20.5
		20.5	19.9	21.4	33.3	
		4.4	13.7	1.5	1.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		44	141	14	6	205
		21.5	68.8	6.8	2.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
14.73818	12	0.2561	0.820	10 OF 20 (50.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.08528	0.1120

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 21

24.

19 JAN 97 ROCES SERVICES SURVEY
09:31:07 THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY IBM 3081D VM/SP CMS

CROSSTABULATION OF LSER LENGTH SLPT SERVICE BY Q13 SHORTCHANGE

LSER	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q13 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 LESS THAN 1 YR		4	20	6	1	31
		12.9	64.5	19.4	3.2	14.3
		10.5	16.0	14.6	7.7	
		1.8	9.2	2.8	.5	
2 1 TO 3 YRS		9	27	9	1	46
		19.6	58.7	19.6	2.2	21.2
		23.7	21.6	22.0	7.7	
		4.1	12.4	4.1	.5	
3 4 TO 6 YRS		11	33	12	4	60
		18.3	55.0	20.0	6.7	27.6
		28.9	26.4	29.3	30.8	
		5.1	15.2	5.5	1.8	
4 7 TO 10 YRS		7	20	4	3	34
		20.6	58.8	11.8	8.8	15.7
		18.4	16.0	9.8	23.1	
		3.2	9.2	1.8	1.4	
5 OVER 10 YRS		7	25	10	4	46
		15.2	54.3	21.7	8.7	21.2
		18.4	20.0	24.4	30.8	
		3.2	11.5	4.6	1.8	
COLUMN TOTAL		38	125	41	13	217
		17.5	57.6	18.9	6.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
5.00483	12	0.9578	1.857	5 OF 20 (25.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.05682	0.2025

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 9

CROSSTABULATION OF LSER LENGTH SLPT SERVICE BY Q14 POOR SUP

LSER	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q14 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	5	ROW TOTAL
1 LESS THAN 1 YR			3	21	5	1	30
			10.0	70.0	16.7	3.3	14.1
			14.3	14.6	11.6	100.0	
			1.4	9.9	2.3	.5	
2 1 TO 3 YRS		1	3	31	11		46
		2.2	6.5	67.4	23.9		21.6
		25.0	14.3	21.5	25.6		
		.5	1.4	14.6	5.2		
3 4 TO 6 YRS		2	3	36	17		58
		3.4	5.2	62.1	29.3		27.2
		50.0	14.3	25.0	39.5		
		.9	1.4	16.9	8.0		
4 7 TO 10 YRS			4	28	3		35
			11.4	80.0	8.6		16.4
			19.0	19.4	7.0		
			1.9	13.1	1.4		
5 OVER 10 YRS		1	8	28	7		44
		2.3	18.2	63.6	15.9		20.7
		25.0	38.1	19.4	16.3		
		.5	3.8	13.1	3.3		
COLUMN TOTAL		4	21	144	43	1	213
		1.9	9.9	67.6	20.2	.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
19.94796	16	0.2226	0.141	14 OF 25 (56.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	-0.12632	0.0329

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 13

CROSSTABULATION OF LSER LENGTH SUPT SERVICE BY Q15 STATE AID

LSER	Q15 STRONG AGREE (1)	AGREE (2)	DISAGREE (3)	STRONG DISAGREE (4)	ROW TOTAL
1 LESS THAN 1 YR	1	3	22	4	30
	3.3	10.0	73.3	13.3	13.8
	20.0	15.8	14.6	9.3	
	.5	1.4	10.1	1.8	
2 1 TO 3 YRS		3	31	12	46
		6.5	67.4	26.1	21.1
		15.8	20.5	27.9	
		1.4	14.2	5.5	
3 4 TO 6 YRS	2	3	42	14	61
	3.3	4.9	68.9	23.0	28.0
	40.0	15.8	27.8	32.6	
	.9	1.4	19.3	6.4	
4 7 TO 10 YRS	2	2	25	6	35
	5.7	5.7	71.4	17.1	16.1
	40.0	10.5	16.6	14.0	
	.9	.9	11.5	2.8	
5 OVER 10 YRS		8	31	7	46
		17.4	67.4	15.2	21.1
		42.1	20.5	16.3	
		3.7	14.2	3.2	
COLUMN TOTAL	5	19	151	43	218
	2.3	8.7	69.3	19.7	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
12.57235	12	0.4009	0.688	9 OF 20 (45.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	-0.05872	0.1941

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 8

CROSSTABULATION OF LSER LENGTH SLPT SERVICE BY Q16 DIST CAN

LSER	Q16	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
LESS THAN 1 YR	1	3	21	5		29
		10.3	72.4	17.2		13.4
		9.7	16.0	10.0		
		1.4	9.7	2.3		
1 TO 3 YRS	2	1	4	27	14	46
		2.2	8.7	58.7	30.4	21.3
		25.0	12.9	20.6	28.0	
		.5	1.9	12.5	6.5	
4 TO 6 YRS	3	2	8	35	16	61
		3.3	13.1	57.4	26.2	28.2
		50.0	25.8	26.7	32.0	
		.9	3.7	16.2	7.4	
7 TO 10 YRS	4	7	21	6		34
		20.6	61.8	17.6		15.7
		22.6	16.0	12.0		
		3.2	9.7	2.8		
OVER 10 YRS	5	1	9	27	9	46
		2.2	19.6	58.7	19.6	21.3
		25.0	29.0	20.6	18.0	
		.5	4.2	12.5	4.2	
COLUMN TOTAL		4	31	131	50	216
		1.9	14.4	60.6	23.1	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
8.37260	12	0.7554	0.537	7 OF 20 (35.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	-0.09494	0.0822

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

TYPE TYPE OF DIST — CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE BY Q10 — NO PROG

TYPE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q10 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 RURAL		37 / 28.9 / 67.3 / 16.8	58 / 45.3 / 56.9 / 26.4	27 / 21.1 / 60.0 / 12.3	6 / 4.7 / 33.3 / 2.7	128 / 58.2
2 SUBURBAN		15 / 19.7 / 27.3 / 6.8	36 / 47.4 / 35.3 / 16.4	14 / 18.4 / 31.1 / 6.4	11 / 14.5 / 61.1 / 5.0	76 / 34.5
3 URBAN		2 / 13.3 / 3.6 / .9	8 / 53.3 / 7.8 / 3.6	4 / 26.7 / 8.9 / 1.8	1 / 6.7 / 5.6 / .5	15 / 6.8
4 SPEC ACT		1 / 100.0 / 1.8 / .5				1 / .5
	COLUMN TOTAL	55 / 25.0	102 / 46.4	45 / 20.5	18 / 8.2	220 / 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
11.73600	9	0.2286	0.082	7 OF 16 (42.8%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.10581	0.0588

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

19 JAN 87 BOCES SERVICES SURVEY
09:31:08 THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY IBM 3081D VM/SP CMS

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE BY Q11 TOP QUAL

TYPE TYPE OF DIST

TYPE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q11 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
RURAL	1	11	84	26		121
		9.1	69.4	21.5		58.5
		64.7	57.5	60.5		
		5.3	40.6	12.6		
SUBURBAN	2	5	52	12	1	70
		7.1	74.3	17.1	1.4	33.8
		29.4	35.6	27.9	100.0	
		2.4	25.1	5.8	.5	
URBAN	3	1	9	5		15
		6.7	60.0	33.3		7.2
		5.9	6.2	11.6		
		.5	4.3	2.4		
SPEC ACT	4		1			1
			100.0			.5
			.7			
			.5			
COLUMN TOTAL		17	146	43	1	207
		8.2	70.5	20.8	.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
4.63486	9	0.8649	0.005	9 OF 16 (56.3%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.04220	0.2730

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 19

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE TYPE OF DIST BY Q12 ENHANCE PROG

TYPE	Q12	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
RURAL	1	27	84	8	2	121
		22.3	69.4	6.6	1.7	59.3
		61.4	60.0	57.1	33.3	
		13.2	41.2	3.9	1.0	
SUBURBAN	2	16	42	5	4	67
		23.9	62.7	7.5	6.0	32.8
		36.4	30.0	35.7	66.7	
		7.8	20.6	2.5	2.0	
URBAN	3	1	13	1		15
		6.7	86.7	6.7		7.4
		2.3	9.3	7.1		
		.5	6.4	.5		
SPEC ACT	4		1			1
			100.0			.5
			.7			
			.5			
COLUMN TOTAL		44	140	14	6	204
		21.6	68.6	6.9	2.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
6.52675	9	0.6863	0.029	10 OF 16 (62.5%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.06963	0.1612

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE BY Q13 SHORTCHANGE

TYPE: TYPE OF DIST

TYPE	Q13 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
1 RURAL	25	76	20	4	125
	20.0	60.8	16.0	3.2	57.9
	65.8	61.3	48.8	30.8	
	11.6	35.2	9.3	1.9	
2 SUBURBAN	11	38	17	9	75
	14.7	50.7	22.7	12.0	34.7
	28.9	30.6	41.5	69.2	
	5.1	17.6	7.9	4.2	
3 URBAN	2	9	4		15
	13.3	60.0	26.7		6.9
	5.3	7.3	9.8		
	.9	4.2	1.9		
4 SPEC ACT		1			1
		100.0			.5
		.8			
		.5			
COLUMN TOTAL	38	124	41	13	216
	17.6	57.4	19.0	6.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
11.13509	9	0.2666	0.060	8 OF 16 (50.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.12622	0.0320

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

32.

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE TYPE OF DIST BY Q14 POOR SUP

TYPE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q14 1 STRONG AGREE	1 AGREE	2 DISAGREE	3 STRONG DISAGREE	4	5	ROW TOTAL
RURAL	1	2	12	79	29			122
		1.6	9.8	64.8	23.8			57.5
		50.0	57.1	55.2	67.4			
		.9	5.7	37.3	13.7			
SUBURBAN	2	2	7	50	14		1	74
		2.7	9.5	67.6	18.9		1.4	34.9
		50.0	33.3	35.0	32.6		100.0	
		.9	3.3	23.6	6.6		.5	
URBAN	3		2	13				15
			13.3	86.7				7.1
			9.5	9.1				
			.9	6.1				
SPEC ACT	4			1				1
				100.0				.5
				.7				
				.5				
COLUMN TOTAL		4	21	143	43		1	212
		1.9	9.9	67.5	20.3		.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
7.91448	12	0.7918	0.005	13 OF 20 (65.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	-0.08243	0.1160

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 14

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE TYPE OF DIST BY Q15 STATE AID

TYPE		Q15 1 STRONG AGREE	1 AGREE	2 DISAGREE	3 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
RURAL	1	3	11	80	32	126
		2.4	8.7	63.5	25.4	58.1
		60.0	57.9	53.3	74.4	
		1.4	5.1	36.9	14.7	
SUBURBAN	2	2	5	60	8	75
		2.7	6.7	80.0	10.7	34.6
		40.0	26.3	40.0	18.6	
		.9	2.3	27.6	3.7	
URBAN	3		3	10	2	15
			20.0	66.7	13.3	6.9
			15.8	6.7	4.7	
			1.4	4.6	.9	
SPEC ACT	4				1	1
					100.0	.5
					2.3	
					.5	
COLUMN TOTAL		5	19	150	43	217
		2.3	8.8	69.1	19.8	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
14.31961	9	0.1114	0.023	9 OF 16 (56.3%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	-0.08145	0.1161

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 9

19 JAN 87 BOCES SERVICES SURVEY
09:31:09 THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY IBM 3091D VM/SP CMS

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE TYPE OF DIST BY Q16 DIST CAN

TYPE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q16 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
RURAL	1	2	16	73	33	124
		1.6	12.9	58.9	26.6	57.7
		50.0	51.6	56.2	66.0	
		.9	7.4	34.0	15.3	
SUBURBAN	2	2	12	47	14	75
		2.7	16.0	62.7	18.7	34.9
		50.0	38.7	36.2	28.0	
		.9	5.6	21.9	6.5	
URBAN	3		3	10	2	15
			20.0	66.7	13.3	7.0
			9.7	7.7	4.0	
			1.4	4.7	.9	
SPEC ACT	4				1	1
					100.0	.5
					2.0	
					.5	
COLUMN TOTAL		4	31	130	50	215
		1.9	14.4	60.5	23.3	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
6.65637	9	0.6728	0.019	9 OF 16 (56.3%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	-0.07014	0.1530

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 11

CROSSTABULATION OF SUBS SUBS TC BY Q10 NC PROG

SUBS		Q10 1 STRONG AGREE	1 AGREE	2 DISAGREE	3 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
YES	1	52	93	40	15	200
		26.0	46.5	20.0	7.5	90.9
		92.9	92.1	88.9	83.3	
		23.6	42.3	18.2	6.8	
NO	2	4	8	5	3	20
		20.0	40.0	25.0	15.0	9.1
		7.1	7.9	11.1	16.7	
		1.8	3.6	2.3	1.4	
COLUMN TOTAL		56	101	45	18	220
		25.5	45.9	20.5	8.2	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
1.89669	3	0.5941	1.636	2 OF 8 (25.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.08499	0.1046

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

CROSSTABULATION OF SUBS SUBS TO BY Q11 TOP QUAL

SUBS		Q11 1 STRONG AGREE	1 AGREE	2 DISAGREE	3 STRONG DISAGREE	4	ROW TOTAL
YES	1	16	134	40	1		191
		8.4	70.2	20.9	.5		92.3
		94.1	92.4	90.9	100.0		
		7.7	64.7	19.3	.5		
NO	2	1	11	4			16
		6.3	68.8	25.0			7.7
		5.9	7.6	9.1			
		.5	5.3	1.9			
COLUMN TOTAL		17	145	44	1		207
		8.2	70.0	21.3	.5		100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
0.28362	3	0.9631	0.077	4 CF 8 (50.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.02529	0.3588

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 19

CROSSTABULATION OF SUBS SUBS TO BY Q12 ENHANCE PROG

SUBS	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q12 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
YES	1	41	132	11	4	188
		21.8	70.2	5.9	2.1	92.2
		93.2	94.3	78.6	66.7	
		20.1	64.7	5.4	2.0	
NO	2	3	8	3	2	16
		18.8	50.0	18.8	12.5	7.8
		6.8	5.7	21.4	33.3	
		1.5	3.9	1.5	1.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		44	140	14	6	204
		21.6	68.6	6.9	2.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
9.91023	3	0.0193	0.471	3 OF 8 (37.5%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.15716	0.0124

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

36.

CROSSTABULATION OF SUBS BY Q13 SUBS TO SHORTCHANGE

SUBS	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q13 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
YES	1	36	115	34	12	197
		18.3	58.4	17.3	6.1	91.2
		94.7	92.7	82.9	92.3	
		16.7	53.2	15.7	5.6	
NO	2	2	9	7	1	19
		10.5	47.4	36.8	5.3	8.8
		5.3	7.3	17.1	7.7	
		.9	4.2	3.2	.5	
COLUMN TOTAL		38	124	41	13	216
		17.6	57.4	19.0	6.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
4.47785	3	0.2143	1.144	3 OF 8 (37.5%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.09480	0.0825

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

39.

CROSSTABULATION OF SUBS SUBS TO POOR SUP BY Q14

SUBS	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Q14 1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	5	ROW TOTAL
YES	1	1	19	136	37	1	194
		.5	9.8	70.1	19.1	.5	91.5
		25.0	90.5	94.4	88.1	100.0	
		.5	9.0	64.2	17.5	.5	
NO	2	3	2	8	5		18
		16.7	11.1	44.4	27.8		8.5
		75.0	9.5	5.6	11.9		
		1.4	.9	3.8	2.4		
	COLUMN TOTAL	4	21	144	42	1	212
		1.9	9.9	67.9	19.8	.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
25.12147	4	0.0000	0.085	6 OF 10 (60.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	-0.11633	0.0456

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 14

19 JAN 87 ROCES SERVICES SURVEY
09:31:10 THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY IBM 3081D VM/SP CMS

CROSSTABULATION OF SUBS SUBS TO STATE AID BY Q15

SUBS	Q15	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
YES	1	5	17	138	38	198
		2.5	8.6	69.7	19.2	91.2
		100.0	89.5	91.4	90.5	
		2.3	7.8	63.6	17.5	
NO	2		2	13	4	19
			10.5	68.4	21.1	8.8
			10.5	8.6	9.5	
			.9	6.0	1.8	
COLUMN TOTAL		5	19	151	42	217
		2.3	8.8	69.6	19.4	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
0.58942	3	0.8989	0.438	4 OF 8 (50.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	0.02311	0.3675

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 9

19 JAN 87 BOCES SERVICES SURVEY
09:31:10 THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY IBM 3081D VM/SP CMS

CROSSTABULATION OF SUBS SUBS TO BY Q16 DIST CAN

SUBS	Q16	1 STRONG AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONG DISAGREE	ROW TOTAL
YES	1	3	28	118	47	196
		1.5	14.3	60.2	24.0	91.2
		75.0	90.3	90.8	94.0	
		1.4	13.0	54.9	21.9	
NC	2	1	3	12	3	19
		5.3	15.8	63.2	15.8	8.8
		25.0	9.7	9.2	6.0	
		.5	1.4	5.6	1.4	
COLUMN TOTAL		4	31	130	50	215
		1.9	14.4	60.5	23.3	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
1.84882	3	0.6044	0.353	4 OF 8 (50.0%)

STATISTIC	VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON'S R	-0.07272	0.1442

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 11

SIZE DIST SIZE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
LESS THAN 500	1	33	14.6	14.6	14.6
501 - 1000	2	43	19.0	19.0	33.6
1001 - 2000	3	74	32.7	32.7	66.4
2001 - 3000	4	31	13.7	13.7	80.1
3001 - 6000	5	30	13.3	13.3	93.4
6001 - 10000	6	13	5.8	5.8	99.1
OVER 1000	7	2	.9	.9	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 3.128 STD DEV 1.447 MINIMUM 1.000
MAXIMUM 7.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

EXP EXPEND PER PUPIL

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
LESS THAN 2500	1	13	5.8	6.2	6.2
$ 2501 TO 3000	2	41	18.1	19.5	25.7
$3001 TO 4000	3	66	29.2	31.4	57.1
OVER $4000	4	87	38.5	41.4	98.6
	5	3	1.3	1.4	100.0
	.	16	7.1	MISSING	
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 3.124 STD DEV .950 MINIMUM 1.000
MAXIMUM 5.000

VALID CASES 210 MISSING CASES 16

TAXR TRUE TAX RATE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
UNDER $15.00	1	43	19.0	20.1	20.1
$15.01 TO 19.99	2	94	41.6	43.9	64.0
$20.00 TO 25.00	3	40	17.7	18.7	82.7
$25.01 TO 30.00	4	11	4.9	5.1	87.9
OVER 30.00	5	25	11.1	11.7	99.5
SPEC DIST	6	1	.4	.5	100.0
	.	12	5.3	MISSING	
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 2.458 STD DEV 1.232 MINIMUM 1.000
MAXIMUM 6.000

VALID CASES 214 MISSING CASES 12

- -

LSER LENGTH SUPT SERVICE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
LESS THAN 1 YR	1	31	13.7	13.7	13.7
1 TO 3 YRS	2	47	20.8	20.8	34.5
4 TO 6 YRS	3	65	28.8	28.8	63.3
7 TO 10 YRS	4	37	16.4	16.4	79.6
OVER 10 YRS	5	46	20.4	20.4	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 3.088 STD DEV 1.317 MINIMUM 1.000
MAXIMUM 5.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

TYPE TYPE OF DIST

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
RURAL	1	132	58.4	58.7	58.7
SUBURBAN	2	77	34.1	34.2	92.9
URBAN	3	15	6.6	6.7	99.6
SPEC ACT	4	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 1.449 STD DEV .642 MINIMUM 1.000
MAXIMUM 4.000

VALID CASES 225 MISSING CASES 1

- - - -

Q7A STAFF DEV

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	55	24.3	24.3	24.3
YES	1	171	75.7	75.7	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .757 STD DEV .430 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q7B CURRIC DEV

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	107	47.3	47.3	47.3
YES	1	119	52.7	52.7	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .527 STD DEV .500 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q7C CIMS

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	145	64.2	64.2	64.2
YES	1	81	35.8	35.8	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .358 STD DEV .481 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

Q7D MEDIA L

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	31	13.7	13.7	13.7
YES	1	195	86.3	86.3	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .863 STD DEV .345 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q7E OTHER

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	150	66.4	66.4	66.4
YES	1	76	33.6	33.6	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .336 STD DEV .473 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q8A ADV SCI

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	222	98.2	98.2	98.2
YES	1	4	1.8	1.8	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .018 STD DEV .132 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

Q8B ADV MATH

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	221	97.8	97.8	97.8
YES	1	5	2.2	2.2	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .022 STD DEV .147 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q8C ADV HUMAN

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	220	97.3	97.3	97.3
YES	1	6	2.7	2.7	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .027 STD DEV .161 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q8D ART

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	213	94.2	94.2	94.2
YES	1	13	5.8	5.8	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .058 STD DEV .233 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

Q8E MUSIC

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	213	94.2	94.2	94.2
YES	1	13	5.8	5.8	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .058 STD DEV .233 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q8F ARV ! L

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	220	97.3	97.3	97.3
YES	1	6	2.7	2.7	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .027 STD DEV .161 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q8G CAI

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	180	79.6	79.6	79.6
YES	1	46	20.4	20.4	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .204 STD DEV .404 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

Q8H OTHER

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	174	77.0	77.0	77.0
YES	1	52	23.0	23.0	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .230 STD DEV .422 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q9A COST EFF

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	86	38.1	38.1	38.1
YES	1	140	61.9	61.9	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .619 STD DEV .487 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q9B TOO FEW

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	178	78.8	78.8	78.8
YES	1	48	21.2	21.2	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .212 STD DEV .410 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

Q9C FEW STUDENTS

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	186	82.3	82.3	82.3
YES	1	40	17.7	17.7	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	.177	STD DEV	.383	MINIMUM	.000
MAXIMUM	1.000				

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q9D BOCES TEACH

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	220	97.3	97.3	97.3
YES	1	6	2.7	2.7	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	.027	STD DEV	.161	MINIMUM	.000
MAXIMUM	1.000				

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q9E NO FACILITES

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	167	73.9	73.9	73.9
YES	1	59	26.1	26.1	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	.261	STD DEV	.440	MINIMUM	.000
MAXIMUM	1.000				

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

Q9F HIGHER QUAL

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	214	94.7	94.7	94.7
YES	1	12	5.3	5.3	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .053 STD DEV .225 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

- -

Q9G OTHER

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RES	0	216	95.6	95.6	95.6
YES	1	10	4.4	4.4	100.0
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN .044 STD DEV .206 MINIMUM .000
MAXIMUM 1.000

VALID CASES 226 MISSING CASES 0

Q10 NO PROG

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
STRONG AGREE	1	56	24.8	25.3	25.3
AGREE	2	102	45.1	46.2	71.5
DISAGREE	3	45	19.9	20.4	91.9
STRONG DISAGREE	4	18	8.0	8.1	100.0
	.	5	2.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 2.133 STD DEV .879 MINIMUM 1.000
MAXIMUM 4.000

VALID CASES 221 MISSING CASES 5

- - - -

Q12 ENHANCE PROG

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
STRONG AGREE	1	44	19.5	21.5	21.5
AGREE	2	141	62.4	68.8	90.2
DISAGREE	3	14	6.2	6.8	97.1
STRONG DISAGREE	4	6	2.7	2.9	100.0
	.	21	9.3	MISSING	
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 1.912 STD DEV .628 MINIMUM 1.000
MAXIMUM 4.000

VALID CASES 205 MISSING CASES 21

- - - -

Q14 POOR SUB

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
STRONG AGREE	1	4	1.8	1.9	1.9
AGREE	2	21	9.3	9.9	11.7
DISAGREE	3	144	63.7	67.6	79.3
STRONG DISAGREE	4	43	19.0	20.2	99.5
	5	1	.4	.5	100.0
	.	13	5.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.075	STD DEV	.625	MINIMUM	1.000
MAXIMUM	5.000				

VALID CASES 213 MISSING CASES 13

- - - -

15 JAN 87 BOCES SERVICES SURVEY
15:02:47 THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY IBM 3081D VM/SP CMS

Q16 DIST CAN

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
STRONG AGREE	1	4	1.8	1.9	1.9
AGREE	2	31	13.7	14.4	16.2
DISAGREE	3	131	58.0	60.6	76.9
STRONG DISAGREE	4	50	22.1	23.1	100.0
	.	10	4.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	226	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.051	STD DEV	.670	MINIMUM	1.000
MAXIMUM	4.000				

VALID CASES 216 MISSING CASES 10